

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/044,060	Applicant(s) MURPHY ET AL.	
	Examiner Terrence R. Till	Art Unit 1744	

All Participants:

 (1) Terrence R. Till.

 (2) J. Moldovanyi.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 April 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102

Claims discussed:

14, 18, 46, 48

Prior art documents discussed:

 6,436,160 (*Stephens et al.*), 6,070,291 (*Bair et al.*), 6,578,230 (*Park et al.*)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 3/29/04, the examiner phoned applicant's representative to inform him that claim 14, as well as some dependent claims could be rejected over the patents mentioned above. Applicant's representative asked that he be given the opportunity to draft a proposed amendment to overcome the prior art. On 4/5/04 the examiner said that the proposed amendment, if made into a formal amendment, would put the application into condition for allowance. The formal amendment was transmitted on 4/5/2004..